DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 333 543 EA 023 038

AUTHOR Wallat, Cynthia
TITLE Directions in Policy and Leadership Studies: Identifying Points of Convergence.
PUB DATE 87
NOTE 121p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, DC, April 20-24, 1987).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; *Communication (Thought Transfer); Decision Making; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Interdisciplinary Approach; *Leadership; *Policy Formation; Research Utilization
IDENTIFIERS Social Science Theory

ABSTRACT

This multidisciplinary analysis identifies how an understanding of information processing and decision making as social processes can determine the effectiveness of educational reform strategies, with a focus on viewing the roles of educational leaders as information processors and policy negotiators. This paper: (1) presents an overview of current research on effective leadership across the disciplines of anthropology, sociology, political science, and sociolinguistics; (2) demonstrates their common focus on the communication process; and (3) and shows how communication theory concepts can provide a common framework that will define the terms for the continued debate on the usefulness of social sciences for policy and leadership studies in education. Methodology involved a review of "Educational Administrative Abstracts" and American Educational Research Association and sociolinguistic data. A conclusion is that concepts from communication theory can help to identify the complexities of actual language usage in presenting information and problem solving in policy and leadership situations. Ten tables are included. (85 references) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. Wallat
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED333543

DIRECTIONS IN POLICY AND LEADERSHIP STUDIES: IDENTIFYING POINTS OF CONVERGENCE

Cynthia Wallat

Florida State University*

Introduction and objective. During the past few years, a spate of educational reform reports and state reform initiatives have stimulated a substantial increase in the quantity and direction of research across a range of social science fields. Cumulatively, policy and leadership studies lead to a more realistic view of what educational leaders can accomplish in the policy arena. This paper builds, in several ways, the theme of a more realistic view of the roles of educational leaders as information processors and negotiators of policy.

The multidisciplinary analysis reported here identifies how understandings of information processing and rule decisionmaking as social processes can help administrators, policymakers, and researchers find out if the spate of reform strategies are working. "Strategies of

*Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC, April 20-24, 1987.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 023038

intervention--are, above all, what policy is about" (Tizard, 1983, p. 237). We should know, for example, how to prepare educational personnel to anticipate that current events might stimulate a re-examination of the assumptions that underpin educational policies which increasingly take the form of rules embodied in statutes, regulatory structures, and court decisions (U.S. Department of Education, 1983). As Elmore (1980) has observed, the traditional devices that policymakers and administrators have relied upon to control strategies of implementation--more specific laws, tighter regulations and procedures, and closer monitoring of compliance--"probably have an effect opposite of that intended. Rather than increasing control they increase complexity. . . . The number of concurrences and agreements necessary to set a policy in motion increases as layers of policy accumulate" (Elmore, 1980, p. 2).

Complexity is probably the most troubling aspect of specifying, monitoring, and amending strategies of intervention that foster learning and promote well-being. Complexity, in its most basic form, is defined in this paper, as a function of: (a) the impact of previous statutory, regulatory, or judicial interventions on current decisionmaking actions; (b) the availability of multiple sources of information and research on alternative strategies which legislators and judges use to fashion

remedies when disputes arise over the implementation and/or interpretation of legislative enactment, judicial decrees, and administrative regulations; (c) the lack of new perspectives that apply concepts developed in different disciplines to the analysis of educational policy functions and roles for educators; and (d) the lack of examples of how to go about constructing a multidisciplinary perspective that may prove useful for identifying rule-making, decisionmaking, and dispute resolution as a social/legal process (cf. U.S. Department of Education, 1983, pp. 10-18).

To take into account this definition of the complexity of getting a handle on policy and leadership studies in legal and educational settings three steps are taken: first, to offer an overview of what is now known about successful leadership skills and functions across the disciplines of anthropology, sociology, political science, and linguistics; second, to point out how propositions across disciplines tie together to focus attention on communication processes; third, to demonstrate how concepts from communication theory and research can provide "a common frame of reference or universe of discourse" that will define the terms of the continued debate on whether social sciences can make a difference in the direction of policy and leadership studies in education (Mitchell, 1980, p. 12).

Building a case for multidisciplinary study of policy and leadership. Despite being characterized as having a wide range of research designs, methodologies, analysis procedures, and assumptions, the educational literature on decisionmaking suggests several areas of agreement regarding how to study policymaking arenas in public education. The first area, outlined on the left side of Table 1, points to the development and utilization of information and research as playing critical roles in policy formation and implementation.

(Insert Table 1 here)

Table 1

Transforming Propositions on Knowledge Utilization in Policy Formulation into Success Propositions on Uses of Information by Educational Leaders

Key propositions on the utility of research for policy formulation and implementation	Involvement of educational leaders in policy decisionmaking is valuable *if* their actions ...
(a) Research findings can influence a policymaker's point of view if the utilization of social science contributes to policymakers scientific expertise *and* social expertise in processes of collaboration in decisionmaking (Mitchell, 1980)	(a) Contribute to recognition of decisionmakers cognitive/scientific expertise *and* social expertise
(b) Research inquiries that lend themselves to building a whole picture of a problem or issue will be used by policymakers more often than process-product research reports (Datta, 1982)	(b) Contribute to building a whole picture of the problem or issue
(c) Research findings from a particular discipline can accumulate with other sources of knowledge *and* basic issues of concern to influence future decisions and actions (Bissell, 1970)	(c) Accumulate across-discipline sources of knowledge *along with* basic issues of concern
(d) Research can stimulate policymakers to derive a unique interpretation of evidence if the interpretation will fit into their respective knowledge base (Kennedy, 1984)	(d) Stimulate unique interpretations of evidence based on respective knowledge base

(Table 1 continued)

Key propositions on the utility of research for policy formulation and implementation	Involvement of educational leaders in policy decisionmaking is valuable <u>if</u> their actions ...
(e) Research can stimulate policymakers to perceive the issues differently than they otherwise would have done if they are involved in the study's qualitative and quantitative design and implementation (Madley, 1982)	(e) Stimulate different perceptions of issues through pinpointing the utility of qualitative and/or quantitative at different stages of decisionmaking
(f) Research can influence user's knowledge of the issues and consequently lead to the adoption of new images of a problem and the use of new metaphors to educate his or her constituency (Mitchell, 1985)	(f) Aim toward adoption of new images of a problem and use of new metaphors
(g) Researchers can provide information that policymakers find more useful in their consideration of issues of teacher quality and improving content by using different oral and written discourse forms and strategies at different stages of the policy process (Brown & Newman, 1982; Cohen, 1986; Florio, Behrmann, & Goltz, 1979; Fuhrman, 1986; Kirst, 1986; Wallat, 1986; Wallat & Piazza, in press)	(g) Provide different oral and written discourse forms and strategies at different stages of the policy process

These seven propositions which were selected to illustrate the view that research has proven useful to federal and state-level legislative personnel, have in general been used mainly to support recognition of a need for further research on knowledge utilization processes. In other words, considering cumulative findings, such as this select sample on the use of information as an end point in the analysis of educational policy actions, generally ends with the indictment that educational research is not always valued (Wallat, 1986). However, as outlined on the right side of Table 1, it is possible to use these findings to build an argument that much more than academic interest can be included in researching information processing. Restatements of key propositions on the use of information in educational policy formulation and implementation suggest different types of information use that will be successful if educational leaders incorporate these findings in their public actions. As Spring (1985) has pointed out, during the last three decades legislative bodies and courts have increasingly called upon educational personnel when forced to decide on issues that touch every aspect of schooling. "Court decisions are being made every day and legal issues are daily becoming more complex" (p. 235). Educational law is at present a whole field of study--from compulsory education laws to laws requiring specific curriculum

content and graduation criteria (Wallat, 1986).

In addition to general agreement that the relationship between policy and educational leadership will become clearer if we consider the outcomes of knowledge utilization actions in lawmaking and court decisionmaking, the calls appearing in educational literature over the past several years suggest that we also consider specifying functions that hold policy and legal roles and actions together. As outlined in Table 2, Mitchell (1985) has developed a model for considering what is now known about the multiple phases/functions of educational policy decisionmaking.

(Insert Table 2 here)

Table 2

Example of a Social Process Decisionmaking Model for Policy and Leadership Studies (cf. Mitchell, 1985)

Policy decision phases/functions	Questions for identifying and defining leadership processes across settings
Intelligence	How is the information that comes to the attention of decisionmakers gathered and processed?
Promotion	How are policy/decision recommendations made and promoted?
Prescription	How are general rules of a newly adopted policy developed/prescribed?
Invocation	How are general rules of the policy provisionally invoked in reference to conduct?
Application	How are rules generally applied?
Appraisal	How is the working of prescriptions appraised?
Termination	How are the prescriptions and arrangements entered into within the framework of such rules brought to termination?

Putting together ideas from educational administration and policy sciences studies, Mitchell´s synthesis of policy decisionmaking functions and information processes points out that there is no hard, fast dogma on the relationship between policy and leadership. The social process model suggested through the list of decisionmaking functions in Table 2 is concerned with interactions and interdependence of functions and processes. For example, the propositions on successful actions leading to information processing and utilization presented in Table 1 may be more or less effective depending upon the particular decision phase/function in operation. The assumption underlying the decisionmaking model in Table 2 is that in order to monitor the possible effects of action and inaction for all types of policy related settings, one needs tools such as a list of phases/functions, or a chart of observational questions that provide a visual representation of the whole system that is being monitored. Thus, Mitchell´s function and process model for the study of a decision process includes a wide variety of terms for expressing what is known about the behavior and situational characteristics of professionals who work in the fields of law, public administration, higher education, and government. As shown in Table 2, the model suggested for the study of relationships between policy and leadership does not include explicit reference to

communicative characteristics, causes, or consequences. Yet this model can accomplish its original purpose which was to organize information in such a way that researchers can build on what is known, and, at the same time, formulate hypotheses about the interactions and interdependence of each of the functions identified. A decisionmaking process model is therefore suited to the task of this paper. The policy and leadership studies summarized in later sections provide vivid portraits of how these functions and processes operate within legal and educational settings.

Constructing a case for multidisciplinary study of policy and leadership does not need to stop with presenting the information processing and decisionmaking propositions presented in Tables 1 and 2. Additional multidisciplinary generalizations about information processing and decisionmaking can be systematically identified. For example, in order to describe, systematically, current directions in policy and leadership studies across anthropology, sociology, political science, and linguistics, a range of journals, indexes, and research projects have been reviewed in addition to the sources used in Table 1 and Table 2. The literature review was organized in the following way. First, content analysis of American Educational Research Association (AERA) volumes from the last seven years was completed for Educational Evaluation

and Policy Analysis, Educational Researcher, and Review of Educational Research. This analysis yielded two types of formulations of success in the policy arena: descriptions of successful leadership skills and prescriptions about desirable policy related roles. The six skills associated with positive judgements of successful leadership are: (a) seeking our opportunities to interact, to learn, and to display administrative skills; (b) recognizing clues that signal diverse and often implicit definitions of an organizational and/or interpersonal situation; (c) adopting a managerial language; (d) cultivating alliances; (e) recognizing, accepting, and enacting varying behaviors with task structure, social composition of peer group, organizational levels, or conditions of organizational levels (e.g., "need" for change); and (f) managing "public impression."

Two conceptually oriented contributions, presented in AERA journals, attempt to effect a new field of vision for connecting the abstract idea of "leadership" to these kinds of success related skills. The two leadership roles that are being predicted as successful are: displays of information in less authoritarian ways, and providing information regarding policy in a skilled negotiation way. The first, administrator/manager as information processor, suggests that information processing is a basic dimension of

leadership behavior and that an understanding of this role must be based on some theoretical perspective that considers social and cognitive processes. In his description of the theoretical and methodological complexities of developing understandings of a social and cognitive role such as information processer, Kendon (1975) argues the need to recognize that we cannot account for what happens in social communicative encounters solely in terms of the separate cognitive psychologies of individual participants. His question is: how does language function strategically to move the information processing process closer to a decision. That is, we cannot account for what happens in communication of information by looking at physical setting, sender and receiver cognitive demands, content of a presentation, or relative exchange of information. These elements all enter, of course, in enacting an information processor role, but they do so mediated by a complex chain of judgements about how what is being communicated is to be interpreted. Speakers and hearers interpret

> (1) what is the main part of a message and what is subsidiary or qualifying information, (2) what knowledge or attitudes are assumed to be shared, (3) what information is old and what is new, and (4) what is the speakers point of view and his/her relationship to or degree of involvement in what is being said. In other words an utterance to be understood must be

> contextualized--this sort of information must be signalled in such a way as to fit the goals and expectations of participants. (Gumperz, Aulakh, & Kaltman, 1982, pp. 28-29)

To appreciate the complexities of the role of educational leader we should begin at the point of recognizing that at any point communication, or miscommunication of information, can occur. Simplistic advice such as "plain speaking," or "clear writing," ignores the crucial fact that communication is processed as it occurs. To explain any communication of information we must understand to what extent speakers signal meanings that hearers interpret as intended. In dealing with communication exchanges"we do not and need not treat the psychological issue of what an individual has in mind, but rather we focus on how intent is interpreted by ordinary listeners in a particular context" (Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz, 1982, p. 17).

The conceptualization of educational leader as negotiator of policy, while definitely less developed than information processor in empirical studies of leadership, nevertheless, holds promise as an analogical construct that can also guide an image or picture of the crucial fact that communication is processed as it occurs. As a negotiator of policy, an educational leader anticipates that language can function strategically to move the information processing

process closer to a decision. Information is provided in ways that function as "presentational" and "persuasional" strategies. "Both strategies are negotiating mechanisms. They provide information while suggesting or specifying how the information should be understood" (Fisher, 1983, p. 143). For example, a "soft sell," or "presentational" strategy provides specific information while suggesting how the audience should make sense of it. Statements such as, "Achievement tests in state funded preschool programs are not required by law. Only about 90% of the children who score high later excel in primary grade achievement tests," suggests a preference: Although tests in preschool aren't absolutely necessary, they certainly are preferable. Whereas "persuasion" strategies are also communicative mechanisms through which the information necessary to negotiate intervention strategy decisions is exchanged, they are "hard" sells. They provide information and specify how it should be understood. An example would be, "Preschool programs are accountable to the state department of education. Periodic reports of teachers' observations of language development and peer group involvement are legitimate accountability mechanisms."

Support for the growing recognition in AERA journals that communication is the key to leadership decisionmaking and problem solving processes can be found in the last five

years of communication citations included in the fortyfive journals reviewed in Educational Administration Abstracts (EAA). Although the fact remains that no term has been so consistently mystifying as "decisionmaking" in leadership studies, and that there are a variety of perspectives of communication from which to choose in educational leadership studies, it is possible to sort out what analytic approaches have been undertaken to develop understandings of the essential elements of information processing and decisionmaking as a communicative process. Given the large number of communication citations included in the Educational Administration Abstracts theme of "Administrative Processes and Organizational Variables," one immediate task in this second stage of the multidisciplinary review was to develop a strategy for categorizing how educational administration researchers have tried to detail essential elements for understanding decisionmaking as a communicative process. Fortunately, comprehensive schemes for approaching this task are available. For example, following his review of contributions toward a comprehensive theory of communications as the key to organizational decisionmaking and problem solving, Lysaught (1984) recommended that the next round of investigations seek to expand conceptual understandings in three directions:

1. Communication Content Analysis--Getting at the "what" of Communications
   - o What is important to talk about, and
   - o What ways are these important subjects treated
2. Communications Surveys--Getting at the "how" of Communications
   - o What actual problems, routes or networks are used for both informal and formal information passage and participation, and
   - o What ways are suggested for improving that system
3. Communication Attitudes--Getting at the "outcomes" of Communications
   - o What has been offered as a theoretical set of guidelines and units of observation and analysis for determining attitudes, opinions, and organizational norms for such dimensions as: goal focus; status and recognition; relationships with peers and supervisors

Following this advice, Table 3 and Table 4 outline historical as well as recent communicative formulations for organizational and decisionmaking behavior. Table 3 summarizes premises that have been available for at least 60 years in educational leadership literature, and outlines a model of communication that has been systematically extended

and expanded upon since 1948 when Herbert Lazwell first suggested "the importance of the Five W´s: "´Who says What, to Whom, in Which Channel, with What effect´" (Lysaught, 1984, p. 103).

(Insert Table 3 here)

Table 3

60 Years of Contributions Toward a Comprehensive Theory of Communication (Lysaught, 1984)

Formulations for organizational communication and decisionmaking -- a 60 year view

1923 Taylor, The Principles of Scientific Management
: need for detailed communications (usually in writing, i.e., for job functions)

1938 Barnard, The Functions of the Executive
: provide for a system of communication
: make known the formal and informal exchange patterns of this communication network
: recognize that communication is the key to organizational decisionmaking and problemsolving
: don't reduce communication to a mechanistic problem, but adopt the perspective that language provides the 'stuff' of rule decisions regarding acceptable behavior; look for satisfactory choices, not optimum

1957 Simon, Administrative Behavior
: without communication there can be no organization

1984 Lysaught, Toward a Comprehensive Theory of Communication: A Review of Selected Contributions
: the current status of a model of organizational communication and decisionmaking, constructed by Lazwell (1948), and a half dozen others who built on this work, encompasses the following:

Variables	Analysis Target
8 elements for communication identified in @ 40 years	transfer of information (source; speaker; encoding; message; noise; decoding; listener; destination)
context for communicating	language of a school or organization as a reflection of the cultural and belief system of that organization, and systems of thought and speech that prevail within the society or larger culture
interpersonal group norms	explain group dynamics in terms of frustrations groups experience when they find disagreement over goals and activities
intended and unintended consequences of using general and impersonal rules	concentrate on the boundaries of the possible, rather than the unknowns of the ideal: in this process communication becomes the key to organizational decisionmaking and problem solving

Despite a small number of individual attempts to extend the target of analysis to include elements of communication; contexts of communicating; interpersonal group norms; and the consequences of communication processes, work on communication and organization, as reflected in Educational Administration journals, has retained a focus on identifying individual competencies. Surveys of individual needs and practices, and communication prescriptions and suggestions for individual administrators, account for 28 out of 33 articles published in the last five years under the topic communication and organization variables.

(Insert Table 4 here)

Table 4

Content Analysis of the Communications Citations from 45 Journals Reviewed for "Educational Administration Abstracts," Vol. 19-Vol. 21

Topics listed under the category "administrative processes and organizational variables"

A. Getting at the "What" of Communication:
What is important to talk about

Targets of Surveys

1. communication skill needs
2. practices of search committees
3. adult reading practices for work and leisure

B. Getting at the "What" of Communication:
What ways are these important topics treated

Prescriptions: communication as an essential skill . . .

4. to establish and build rapport
5. to establish trust
6. for enacting a facilator role
7. to establish high morale
8. to manage attention and make connections between information and decisions
9. to have well planned meetings
10. to avoid "bamboozelment" of the la nguage and maintain high standards
11. to manage educational programs

Improvement Suggestions: communication treated as . . .

12. public relations ideas
13. increased use of metaphor
14. increased use of anecdotes
15. effective presentations
16. listening ideas
17. use of MIS concepts (Management Information Systems)
18. reading ideas
19. writing ideas
20. video teleconferencing ideas
21.-28. teacher/student communication patterns

(Table 4 Continued)

Topics listed under the category "administrative processes and organizational variables"
C. Getting at the "How" and "Outcomes" of Communication
Calls for Research
29. understanding of culture as a variable aspect of organizations is feasible: differentiation of communication rules between organizational units can be specified
30. evaluative dimensions of leaders' communicative style are used most often
31. teacher and administrator roles should be viewed as elements of information processing repertoires of organizations
32. communication processes in participation structures are more complex than previously thought
33. a comprehensive theory of communication remains to be constructed

As vital as communication is in linking information processing and decisionmaking (Sproull, 1981), and as consuming as it is in the forty plus separate meetings and conversations that administrators initiate during three quarters of their workday (cf. Boyer, 1983; Hannaway, 1985; Sproull, 1981; Wolcott, 1973), little is still known about "how" educational leaders structure and manage what has been characterized as "choppy" "unpredictable" and "interrupted" attention demands from one subject and medium of communication[1] to the next (Sproull, 1981). As Sproull (1981) has argued: while the assumption of theories about information processing and managing organizations is a connectedness assumption, "it is not sufficient to assume that if relevant information is intended for actors in the system they will become connected to it" (p. 114).

In considering this dilemma, Lysaught (1984), and other educational leadership researchers (e.g., Brown, Newman, & Rivers, 1984; Glasman, 1979; Kennedy, 1984; Murphy, Hallinger, & Mitman, 1983; Sproull, 1981), have proposed examining how the work of theorists across disciplines, including linguistics, may offer a concrete set of guides and units of observation and analysis for the clarification of the social and cognitive determinants of information processing and decisionmaking norms. The target of this multidisciplinary search is to find essential pieces of

missing knowledge that will help to examine how "information is connected to decisions; decisions are connected to action; action generates more information; and so forth" (Sproull, 1981, p. 113).

Building a case for a communicative framework. As shown in Table 5, comparison of leadership studies which identify successful information processing skills, and knowledge utilization studies which suggest contributions that are considered valuable in educational policy decisionmaking, lead to the conclusion that information is connected to decisions and decisions are connected to action through communication processes. In other words, one key point of convergence in leadership and policy studies is that both areas of study lead to a communicative perspective for addressing a basic question: What is it that holds roles and actions together to make policy more effective?

Reviews of research on programs designed to prepare professionals for leadership positions in the fields of law, public administration, higher education, and government suggest that the answer to this basic question depends upon addressing two needs across these fields (Dinham & Stritter, 1986). These needs include:

- To identify, develop, or use specific concepts of communication skills that can be linked to the theory or theories of action by which the

profession is practiced

- To identify, develop, or use learning processes, skills, and attitudes associated with the acquisition of context specific discourse forms and strategies for presenting information and participating in group problem solving

(Insert Table 5 here)

Table 5

Comparison of Key Propositions on Successful Information Processing Skills Among Educational Leaders and Key Propositions on Successful Information and Research Utilization in Educational Policy Decisionmaking

Successful Information Processing Skills	Successful Contributions to Educational Policy Decisionmaking	Convergence Point Between Successful Skills and Functions
seeking out opportunities to interact . . . to learn implicit "rules"	accumulate across-discipline sources of knowledge along with basic issues of concern	identify, develop, or use specific concepts of communication skills that can be linked to the theory or theories of action by which a professional role is practiced (i.e., information processor and negotiator of policy)
recognizing clues that signal diverse and often implicit definitions of success	contribute to building a whole picture of the problem or issue	
adopting a managerial language	develop new images of a problem and/or develop and use new metaphors	
cultivating alliances	contribute to recognition of policymakers cognitive/ scientific expertise and social expertise	
enacting varying behaviors with shifts in task structure	provide different oral and written discourse strategies	
managing "public impression"	stimulate unique interpretation of evidence; policies; rules	

In order to meet the objective of relating the formulations of successful information processing skills, and the formulations of successful contributions to educational policy decisionmaking, to general principles of language use in social contexts, we can not simply stop at the point of filling out the details of new role descriptions of educational leadership. As demonstrated above, the AERA data sources, and the EAA data sources, converge in highlighting a need to consider successful context related aspects of the role of educational leaders as information processor and negotiator of policy. At issue is what is meant by "context related aspects" of new public communication roles, or language relationships between policy and leadership. The next two sections on current thinking regarding language relationships, and new concepts in sociolinguistics, attempt to clarify the idea, "context related aspects."

The language relationship between policy and leadership. Before beginning a detailed account of general principles of language use identified in educational policy, leadership, and linguistic data sources, a few of the assumptions underlying the policy and leadership perspective taken in this paper should be mentioned. One is that a range of diverse approaches to developing an understanding of educational policy are available. However, Dye (1984)

recommends that researchers concerned with understanding public policy avoid elaborate academic discussions of definitions of policy. Instead he recommends a simple definition: "Public policy is whatever governments choose to do or not to do" (p. 2). Note that Dye (1984) focuses not only on government legal action, "but also on government inaction, that is, what government chooses not to do" (p. 2). The contention here is that government inaction in the major areas of education policy which include academic requirements, budgeting, personnel, and resources and facilities for programs, can have just as great an impact as government action. As developed further in later sections of this paper, the policy related communicative processes and functions identified in the multidiscipline analysis highlight the need to consider how educators deal with interpreting what legislators have chosen to do or not to do.

Taking a stance that is similar to Dye's (1984) treatment of definitional issues in policy sciences, Murphy, Hallinger and Mitman (1983) argue that as movement continues toward a refinement of what educational leadership is, more attention must be devoted to promoting a conception of leadership that is consistent with what can or can not be accomplished in different types of organizational arrangements in schools. They propose that "it is the

ability to call appropriate behaviors into action in a given circumstance that characterizes effective leaders" (Murphy, Hallinger, & Mitman, 1983, p. 300). For example one general problem with current conceptions of educational leadership is that the particular definitions upon which leadership is based are too often limited to comparison of surface variables. Variables such as "confidence" or "assertiveness" are used to divide educators into the haves and have nots. Dye (1984) contends that the focus for identifying and defining educational policy should be describing and defining the consequences of government action and inaction. Similarly, Murphy, Hallinger, and Mirman´s (1983) work suggests that the focus for identifying and defining leadership should be to consider findings such as behavioral haves and have nots as a socio-psychological phenomenon. One example of this focus would be to consider the possibility of the use of different indirect and direct leadership behaviors in different situations with different individuals, especially processes and functions which suggest how educational leaders accumulate and use influence in the policy arena.

The theoretical limitation identified by Murphy and his colleagues is not a small point and cannot be brushed aside. Experience has taught us that there is no reason to assume that the recent tidal wave of educational legislation on

higher education standards; more time on task; more rigorous testing for students, teachers, and administrators; and, more use of effective teaching and principal performance will be equally beneficial for all students (Wallat, 1986). Consequently, finding answers to the questions of how educational leaders become involved in focusing on the problems, successes, and unanswered questions of public concern and state reform efforts, has, as Strike (1979) points out, a long future.

Sociolinguistics concepts. Questions regarding involvement in public concerns, or the topic of language in public life, have been addressed in the specialized area of linguistics known as sociolinguistics. One basic premise of sociolinguistics is that communicative skills have been radically altered in our society. Increasing participation in public affairs leads to the introduction of the need to manage or adapt to the rhetorical strategies of bureaucratically accepted modes of communication. From the filling out of application forms, committee and salary negotiations, formal hearings, and public debates and discussions, assumptions about how verbal and/or written information is to be conveyed are critical and these are assumptions which may vary widely even within the same socioeconomic group in the same community (cf. Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz, 1982).

Sociolinguistis have consistently argued that it is theoretically unsound to make generalizations about communication processes in public life which cannot be related to how language is actually used in the speech events referred to above. It is equally unsound to make inferences on the basis of observations and anecdotes about successful role functions without considering the complexities of the contexts of public settings and language use.

The premise argued in this paper is that educators, researchers, and decisionmakers will find recent work in linguistics useful in so far as central concepts from this discipline are relevant to language in public life. Formulations of descriptions and prescriptions, and perceptions of utility are of no interest in themselves unless we can relate them to general principles of language use in social contexts. The potential for such a check is available. A set of central concepts which together form a composite of a communicative perspective can be presented in a way that lends itself to addressing professional preparation needs and unanswered questions regarding why these processes and functions are successful.

The unanswered questions that bring these concepts together into a coherent framework and that tie together the multidiscipline analysis include:

- What is it about spoken and written practices in modern society that increases the importance of understanding individual communicative resources, that is, the individual´s ability to manage or adapt to diverse communicative situations?
- How do individuals as human information processors and participants in legal/social/educational systems interact with educational policy, interpret its meaning, decide its relevance, and hence determine whether they will permit the policy to influence them?

These questions provide future researchers with a guide worth testing in case studies of language in the policy arena.

One way to consider the development of a case study on the language relationship between policy and leadership is to consider theoretical concepts that have considerable empirical support in sociolinguistic studies of participation processes, and oral and written processes. Following consideration of how a set of theoretical language concepts may support a conceptualization such as information processing as a social process, and rule decisionmaking as a social process, it is then possible to turn attention to developing more concrete meanings for these concepts. This can be accomplished by setting theoretical premises included

in each language concept against detailed descriptions of a social setting such as an educational setting or legal setting. In the case of studies of language in use in policy and leadership, two areas of descriptions are available to draw upon. First, theoretical language concepts can be set against formulations of successful skills and functions. Second, theoretical language concepts can be set against observations of settings in which successful skills and functions are clearly visible (cf. Reynolds, 1983).

The remainder of this paper will be devoted to a discussion of three issues related to concepts: (a) the identification of nine concepts that have emerged in the last decade to explore the ways language is used to construct participation structures and norms of participation in public settings, and to obtain detailed descriptions of the regularities that co-occur in discourse forms, (b) the suggestion that theoretical concepts related to language in use lend support to a conceptualization of information processing and rule decisionmaking as a social process, and (c) a demonstration of how it is possible to identify instances of oral and written language in use concepts in concrete descriptions of educational and legal settings.

Given the fact that educational research and

educational administration journals have primarily contributed to the conceptualization of information processing as a social process, the demonstration of instances of language in use concepts in legal settings reaches out to research reports sponsored by the National Science Foundation Law and Social Science Program. This extended coverage helps to demonstrate a wider understanding of variables to consider when one asks: What is it that holds roles and actions together to make policy more effective? Or, more pragmatically, to extend the question of what information processing processes contribute to success as an educational leader in policymaking, to include what does successful rule decisionmaking involve.

Participant structure. Within the basic framework of verbal and nonverbal communication, there are several possible variations in ways individuals arrange communication, which Philips (1983) refers to as "participant structure." Essentially these structural arrangements of discourse can fall into many different types. In one type of participant structure one individual may address the entire group, or the talk flows as if first-come-first-served reporting turns were being taken. Other arrangements include attention focused on one-to-one encounters between individuals, or attention focused on written materials.

> At any given point in time, it is usually possible to identify the particular general arrangement in use through the positioning, alignment, and gaze direction pattern of [participants]; or, in other words, to determine how involvement has been allocated, [ended or recommenced, or topics shifted]. (Philips, 1983, p. 85)

Studies of participant structures have provided a set of concepts to help identify the most common ways individuals verbally acknowledge and incorporate, or fail to incorporate or ratify, speakers utterances. Identifying, developing, and using specific concepts of participant structure strategies may help individuals make inferences from a speaker's patterns of "ratification and nonratification that will inform them as to what sorts of mistakes they are making" (Philips, 1983, p. 90).

Construction of social norms. The possibility of identifying, defining, and using social processes of presenting information and participating in group problem solving through the study of discourse forms and strategies centers around recognition of individuals both as interpreter of the world and a source of influence on others. Based on this conceptualization and in light of recent research on participant structures, the concept of construction of norms as process is proposed in

sociolinguistic studies in contrast to the view of socialization as a discrete set of norms and rules inculcated into passive participants (Wallat & Green, 1982). Today individuals are faced with negotiating a complex system of arbitrary norms and rules within social institutions: Arbitrary in the sense of evolving definitions of the meaning of social situations and situations in which not all rules and expectations are clearly stated. To date, analysis of social groups that rests on recognition of these observations have indicated that norms of interaction are usefully viewed as sociolinguistic rules for communicating. Sociolinguistic rules which are modified, checked, suspended, terminated, and recommenced,

> help inform individuals about when to speak, how to speak (i.e., what gestures, movements, intonation, stress, and pitch features should be used), how to get a turn, how to digress from a topic appropriately, and to whom messages should be addressed. (Wallat & Green, 1982, p. 101)

In other words, sociolinguistic rules are not static but are the result of a coordination process in which every social situation, or social context, is essentially a question of solving the "rule" or meaning of coordination signals.

In order to establish and maintain social interaction,

> the participants must have agreed upon signals for beginning and ending a single social occasion. . . . Therefore, the problem facing those concerned with the construction of social norms or sociolinguistic rules for knowing when to speak is to capture the elements of a group´s system of signalling coordination conventions including not only verbal statements but the participant´s gestures in relation to objects or other persons in the environment. (Wallat & Green, 1982, p. 118)

From this perspective the study of socialization in policy and leadership settings is the study of how individuals arrive at an interpretation of the content of a policy or rule that matches the social situation at that moment in time and place.

Enactment of routines. One routine interpretation task that flows from changes in policy is the placement of students in grade level and type of program. The way in which such everyday decisions are reached, or information regarding these decisions is distributed in institutional settings cannot be described simply by adding a few more factors to a psychological model or to a model of social operation. "A complete cognitive theory needs to include a description of both psychological and social cognitive operations, as well as a description of their articulation

together" (Mehan, 1984, p. 63). Mehan (1984) introduced and explicated the concept of enactment of routines to suggest how organizational behavior can be understood less as a set of "acts," "choices," and searches for "reasons" and "motives" and more as end results or consequences of an organization's functions.

Investigations of organizational practices of gathering information and participating in decisionmaking which are based on this concept are productive in two ways. First, they do not fall into the trap of positing a gap between some ideal model that assumes unlimited access to unlimited resources and the actual practice model that is identified. Second, they help to identify valid organizational reasons why institutional decisionmaking occurs in the way that it does. Given the expectation that educators will continue to be faced with the compulsory thrusts of laws regarding placement of students and personnel, social cognitive concepts such as the "enactment of routines," appear useful for turning up "good organizational reasons" for information processing to be structured in the way that it is (cf. Mehan, 1984, p. 54).

Style shifts. Turns taken in participant structures, norms constructed, modified, or suspended during these participation situations, and the routines enacted in institutional settings are all made up of the basic tools

with which people communicate. "Anything that is said must be said in some way, and that way is style" (Tannen, 1984, p. 2). One basic issue for understanding information processing as a social process is semantics: How do people communicate and interpret meaning in conversation?

> Each person's decisions about which [communication] strategy to apply and to what extent in a given situation results in her/his characteristic style. That style, then, is made up of a range on the continum, the particular degree of camaraderie or deference, for example, shifting in response to the situation, the people participating, the subject at hand, and so on. Each person's notion of what strategy is appropriate to apply is influenced by a combination of family background and other interactive experience. (Tannen, 1984, pp. 13-14)

Schema/frames. The consequences of background and other interactive experiences during a particular enactment of institutional routines in educational, medical, and social services have also been addressed in communication theory and research. Although the concepts of schema and frame have a range of definitions, the definition of schema as "knowledge structures in the minds of participants--sets of expectations that people have for objects, settings, and the structure of interaction" (Tannen & Wallat, 1983,

p. 208) is the definition suggested here. The definition of frames that is useful for considering information processing as a social process is frames as the superordinate message (or metamessage) about what actually is being engaged in, and what changes of frame such as moving from asking a question to keeping quiet are considered appropriate. "The frame is the definition of what is going on, without which no message could be interpreted" (Tannen & Wallat, 1983, p. 207).

One clear example of the concepts of schema and frame in communication is the identification of the way that information is asked for--indeed the fact that it is asked for--can influence the information given in response. In other words, what you say, and how you say it, are interpreted and evaluated by other participants to infer what participant structure (what norms and styles) are called for. These two concepts, schema and frame, provide a basis for identifying how individuals from different backgrounds present their discipline based knowledge, and their individual and social differences in style and interpretation of communication cues; specific participant presentation may, or may not affect the use of information (Tannen & Wallat, 1986).

Language per se is ambiguous. While communication researchers have long recognized that constraints such as

the impossibility for our brains to keep track of all the nuances or potential information cues that take place in the environment apply to many aspects of behavior, they further argue that these constraints apply to language behavior in particular. In other words the connection between information overload, and the need to simplify the complexity of our world, are of particular interest to communication researchers because language serves as a rich source for demonstrating the existence of individual and social differences in cognitive decision models (Freedle, 1980).

Part of the answer of how we manage to survive in this complex, ambiguous, and less redundant (i.e., changing) environment is, "we do it by oversimplifying the world: we schematize it" (Freedle, 1980, p. 1). The strengths for schema functioning are that over time, with a great deal of practice, we are able to select and use nuances as information cues that can potentially be used to convert very complex tasks which originally required hundreds of decisions into virtually automatic tasks. Thus even though we are cognitively quite limited in representing any language with all the nuances that can potentially be used, "nevertheless, given a redundant cultural setting and given lots of time, we can build up an arsenal of complex schemata for handling all the useful functions for all the

significant settings that a culture typically experiences" (Freedle, 1980, p. 2).

The rub in all this, is that, language is, in the sense of selective representation of all the nuances that can be noted, necessarily an incomplete and ambiguous representation of reality.

> We tend not to notice the ambiguity of language for as long as we operate within the well-rehearsed norms of a particular language community. That is, by virtue of being in a language community for many years, a large repertoire of complex linguistic and paralinguistic schema can be learned, and come to operate in function in an almost automatic way. These linguistic and paralinguistic norms (intonation cues, eye-gaze patterns, junctures of discourse, etc.)[2] are further smoothly merged with social conventions and values that must be honored in communication within a community . . . [However] even though a large number of complex schema can be learned and used in an almost automatic way, still error is inevitable, even within a community, because schematizations are necessarily incomplete or ambiguous representations of the environment. (Freedle, 1980, pp. 2-3)

Linguists have presented some interesting examples of miscommunciation that can be traced to the ambiguity of

language. Of particular interest to an education audience are recent attempts at the Center for the Study of Writing (University of California, Berkeley) to identify how students justify their choices for answers on reading and writing tests. Following Chafe (1977), Filmore and O´Connor (1986) suggest that there are wide differences in how individuals choose to structure the details about a topic, and how they choose to make summarizing statements about the same topics. Among the choices identified to date are: (a) begin by summarizing an event and then giving details, or (b) build up details and then present the summary at the end. These discourse forms are just another way of demonstrating, or illustrating very clearly, Freedle´s (1980) two findings across ethnographic studies of language use: First, that language forms and context are necessarily incomplete in specifying the full intentions of writers and speakers and so individuals choose schemas to help guide their selection of an answer. Second, that language per se is ambiguous and so to comprehend an oral or written passage individuals must necessarily initiate some interpretative frames to fill in the information that is needed.

Interpretative frames. Although we lack the conceptual tools for removing all sources of ambiguity, we can begin to learn to reflect on the complexities of dealing with ambiguity by using linguistic concepts in leadership and

policy studies. Concepts such as participant structures, sociolinguistic norms, variants or language styles, background and knowledge schema and interactive frames would be useful as a set of inquirying systems or model for studying communication and change (cf. Freedle, 1980; Hymes, 1979; Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz, 1982). This, of course, is am bitious, but just labeling events in communication does not justify introducing linguistic concepts in the study of leadership and policy (cf. Freedle, 1980, p. 23). For example, the idea that language per se is ambiguous, and that utterances and actions are "embedded in more ambiguous and swiftly moving streams of social interaction" (Mishler, 1979, p. 2), can be linked to professional actions by further considering how individuals comprehend an utterance or full text through initiating interpretative frames to fill in the information that is unstated or misidentified. The possibility of identifying, developing, and using a concept of communication skills such as interpretative frame, and linking this concept to professional actions, seems particularly optimistic given the fact that most educational researchers have had so much experience in using this skill. The expectation most would-be successfully published educational researchers have learned to act upon is to pause on two questions: In general, How adequate are the grounds for our interpretation

of the phenomena or behavior under study? and, more specifically, Have we adequately considered the multiple meanings that any surface language form can have to the readers of our report? (cf. Cazden, 1986, p. 438). For many, these implicit developments of understanding the construction of meaning, and meaning in context, have underscored the importance of choosing specific linguistic devices to persuade, inform, proclaim, or develop an argument. In other words, the conventions used to make connections in the audiences' mind between intent and meaning essentially add up to constructing an interpretative frame.

This brief illustration of interpretative frame shows that intelligibility, or dealing with ambiguity, is not contingent upon finding an illusive set of perfectly clear words to connect intent and meaning, but constructing an interactive frame that can disambiguate the authors' or speakers' intent (cf. Gumperz, 1982a; 1982b).

Functions of language. The question of how actors communicate information and persuade others in actual situations is still far from being resolved. Some have observed that "it is not words which mean things but [individuals] who, by words, mean things, that a statement does not represent a fact but that [individuals], by a statement, mean facts" (Demauro, 1967, p. 2). Yet linguists

have argued that unanswered questions raised by this observation will remain at issue until we further develop understandings of the dependence of meaning and function in language through developing emphasis on the processes of communication in public life:

> It has become clear that mutual understanding depends not only on common linguistic means, in the narrow sense, but also on common ways of using and interpreting speech. People who know the same sounds, words, and syntax may not know the same rules for interpreting utterances as requests or commands; the same rules for the topics that can be introduced . . . ; for taking turns and getting the floor; for making allusions; avoiding insults, showing respect and self-respect in choice of words, etc. (Hymes, 1972, p. xxxviii)

We can begin to analyze these facts of language in public life more precisely. In general the speaking, listening, writing, and reading communication repertoire of individuals comprise at least seven functions of language (i.e., getting things done; controlling the behavior of others; telling about oneself; using forms of personal expression and social interaction; finding out about things; communicating something for the information of others; relating to contexts of use as speaker, listener, writer,

and reader) (cf. Wallat, 1984, pp. 24-25). Essentially, those who speak and write for public audiences are attempting to solve the problem of creating what linguists refer to as "the 'textual' function, whereby language becomes text, is related to itself and to its context of use. Without the textual component of meaning, we should be unable to make any use of language at all" (Halliday, 1973, p. 44).

Halliday (1973) has proposed that the oral and written structure of an individual's language should be viewed as representing social behavior; as "meaning potential"; as functional options chosen among the linguistic resources all writers and speakers have; and as realization of the social context at a particular time and place. Halliday (1973) has also argued that by taking a functional viewpoint we can gain some idea about how "meaning is related both to the internal structure of language and to the social contexts in which language operates: (p. 8) . . . functionally the choice of an item may have one meaning, its repetition another and its location in structure yet another" (p. 109). More specifically, Hymes (1979) argues that the greatest challenge to research is to <u>start</u> from recognition of social history and social structure to understand the character of oral and written functional competence in a given case. Such a linguistics, or study of language in public life,

will have an essential property. Its practice and theory will be adequate to all the means employed in oral and written language and all the meanings inherent in choice of dialect, variety, style, conversation or narrative genre, or the occasion to speak or be silent.

> Theory of competence will go beyond the study of the innate and universal abilities of [personkind] to study the kinds of opportunities valued and permitted in a given society, and to the study of opportunity and obstacles of access to kinds of competence. It will recognize that the very role of speaking, of language and use of language, is not the same in every society [, institution, or group of persons]. (Hymes, 1979, p. 10)

One problematic area of oral and written language in public life is identifying, developing and using context specific discourse forms, functions, and strategies for presenting information and participating in problem solving (cf. Dinham & Stritter, 1986). Today the eventual success or failure of research utilization in the policy arena depends upon the extent to which linguistic knowledge is called upon in response to the need for policy reports capable of accomplishing a range of functions and discourse forms. The extent of that range was introduced in Table 1, Transforming Propositions on Knowledge Utilization in Policy

Formulation into Success Propositions on Uses of Information by Educational Leaders, and is further explicated in the list of discourse functions presented in Table 6, Targets of Analysis of Functions and Discourse Forms Used in Policy Reports.

(Insert Table 6 here)

Table 6

Targets of Analysis of Functions and Discourse Forms Used in Policy Reports (cf. Wallat & Piazza, in process)

1.1. Role description: Negotiator of Policy

- What is it about spoken and written practices in modern society that increases the importance of understanding individual communicative resources, that is, the individual's ability to adapt to diverse communicative situations?

1.2. Collection of policy reports highlighting the following 10 discourse forms:

accountability:	to assure laws, policies, rules, contracts, are honored
case study:	to concentrate on a single case and its complexity
discrepancy:	to emphasize formal objectives and their contrasts and impact
ethnographic:	to emphasize cultural relationships
experimental:	to report "controlled" treatments that aim toward assessment
expert opinion:	to organize information around providing feedback for decisionmaking
illuminative:	to portray situations as readers themselves may see things
judicial:	to optimize presentation of the cases for and against
naturalistic:	to observe ordinary events in natural settings
responsive:	to fix on meanings and concerns held by key constituencies

1.3. Concepts from linguistic research that help students master the discourse forms presented above.

Although this paper will not describe the learning processes, skills, and attitudes associated with the acquisition of context specific discourse forms found in policy reports, many of the concepts from linguistic research that are introduced here are also being used in a current project that addresses communicative professional preparation needs through analysis of the relations between function and form in the preparation and presentation of policy reports (Wallat & Piazza, in process). The results of analysis of the functions and forms of language in an information processing society is a picture of the implicit rules for appropriate styles of text and talk operative at any moment; the cues that mark junctures between phases of the activity; and the participant structures intended for holding roles and actions together. In other words, the result is a picture of both oral and written "discourse structure, and therefore of the demands made on participants´ communicative competence" (Cazden, 1986, p. 437).

Communicative competence. Succinctly stated, the concept of communicative competence is "the knowledge of linguistic and communicative conventions that speakers must have to initiate and sustain conversational involvement" (Gumperz, 1982c, p. 325). Studies of communicative competence have helped to widen the lens of both theory and

research design to capture what besides grammatical diversity, stylistic resources and options, and interpretative processes are essential components of communication resources that individuals rely on to accomplish their goals in everyday life. Empirical findings that by now have become generally accepted are that outsiders who enter a new demographic or professional scene

> may learn a new language or dialect well at the level of sentence grammar or lexicon, and this knowledge is sufficient for the instrumental contacts . . . that fill up much of the working day. But situations of persuasion, where what is evaluated is the ability to explain, describe, or narrate, are often difficult to manage. Here breakdowns tend to lead to mutual stereotyping and pejorative evaluations.
>
> To be sure not all problems of inter [group] contact are communicative in nature. Economic factors, differences in goals and aspirations, as well as other historical and cultural factors, may be at issue. (Gumperz, 1982c, p. 331)

But there is reason to suspect from past studies of participant structure differences across contexts (Green, 1983; Cazden, 1986); interactive frames and knowledge structure schemas across contexts (Tannen & Wallat, 1986); and characteristics of dozens of visible information cues,

or what linguists refer to as contextualization cues that may become part of interpretive frames across a range of communicative contexts (Wallat, 1984), that a significant number of communication breakdowns may be due to the failure to establish a successfully negotiated frame of interpretation. According to studies of language in public life designed and conducted by Professor John Gumperz, the concept of establishing a successfully negotiated frame of reference refers to the time and effort spent on reaching agreement on what activity is being enacted and how it is conducted (Gumperz, 1982a, p. 167).

> Distinctions among such activities as chatting, discussing, and lecturing exist in all cultures, but each culture has its own constraints not only on content but also on the ways in which particular activities are carried out and signaled. Even within a culture, what one person would identify as ´lecturing´ another might interpret as ´chatting with one´s child,´ . . . Since speech activities are realized in action and since their identification is a function of ethnic and communicative background special problems arise in modern society where people have widely varying communicative and cultural backgrounds. How can we be certain that our interpretation of what activity is being signalled is the same as the activity that the

> interlocutor has in mind, if our communicative backgrounds are not identical? (Gumperz, 1982a, pp. 166-167)

It is here that policy, leadership, and communication work on information processing and rule decisionmaking as a social process takes on special importance.

Information Processing as a Social Process

This section provides a detailed description of the current context of interest in policy related processes and policy related functions among educators. As previously mentioned, during the past several years major educational research journals have included a range of multidisciplinary articles related to raising the level of awareness on what is involved in gaining knowledge about educational programs, policies, procedures, and participants (i.e., students, faculty, parents) and using that knowledge to sort, sift, interpret, translate, and act on information rather than merely accumulating it (Sadler, 1980). One of the contentions of such work is that through observation and analysis those who would be educational leaders can tap into implicit, incidental knowledge of those they work with, and, as such, make reasonable judgements and decisions.

As Cohen and Garet (1975) reminded us over a decade ago, "the idea that better knowledge produces better

decisions is not exactly a . . . novelty, and the equation of better knowledge with social science is at least [eighty] years old in the United States" (p. 18). Other educational policy researchers have expressed beliefs similar to Cohen and Garet's conclusion that the disappointing results of efforts to improve decisionmaking by producing better knowledge is due to lack of understanding of the relationship between knowledge and action. White, Cohen, and Garet argue that the process of gathering and presenting information should not be viewed simply as technical activity but "like discourse, [as] a loose and unstable connection with other sorts of social action" (p. 42), Wildavsky (1977) has argued that analysis should be viewed as a stance, not a technique. The jist of his argument is that:

> There is not a single set of operations that can be taught as the essence of analysis. But there is a way of looking at the world in terms of opportunity . . . , in terms of what must be given up to do whatever one wishes, in terms of . . . [how] a story is told, a dilemma is outlined, and a problem stated. . . . Analysis may be considered as a form of [observation] in which analysts ask whether the few variables that are able to consider may be more important than the endless number they are forced to omit. Knowing what

can be left out . . . is crucial to the art of analysis. (p. 17)

While Cohen, Garet, and Wildavsky have helped to illuminate the black box lying between knowledge and action in leadership studies, a growing understanding of how to explore individual differences in the processes used to gather information in educational and policy contexts did not materialize until educational researchers began to question the confusing findings on successful schools and effective principals. On one hand,researchers had shown that educational organizations provide opportunities for learning administrative and policymaking behaviors, while on the other, researchers pointed to lack of agreement about the skills and attitudes important for success as educational leaders (Miskil & Cosgrove, 1985). "Confusing findings led researchers to question the meaning of ´success´ to respondents" (Adkinson, 1981, p. 316); to note the emergence of "uncertainty about whether it is effective principals that create effective schools or effective schools that create effective principals" (Murphy, Hallinger, & Mitman, 1983, p. 299); and, to address the emergence of "increased demands on administrators for data gathering . . . and increased behavioral uncertainties on their part" (Glasman, 1979, p. 40).

Cumulatively the results of studies which followed

these leads suggest a new role and set of skills that help operationalize what Cohen, Garet, and Wildavsky referred to as a stance or a way of looking at the world and a way of making connections between knowledge and actions. Kennedy (1984) has defined the role of leadership as information processor: an individual who explores the ways in which different sources of knowledge contribute to individual thought; who raises the importance of group interpretation in interpreting knowledge; who recognizes that shared interpretations of information could develop from such activities as persuasive debates, negotiations, bargaining, and so forth; and who recognizes that if there does exist a best interpretation of information it is not obvious that group processes would necessarily produce that interpretation: by the time information "is interpreted by individuals and then debated by the group, its meaning could evolve into quite a different form than it originally had" (p. 208).

Building on the same theme of skill in managing interpretations of information, James (1982) has identified a shift in public expectation regarding how educational leaders are expected to deal with information in public meetings. He points out that legislators are increasing state policy for schools and thereby decreasing the role of local boards of education in policymaking. We may expect to

see both the boards of education and administrators more and more engaged in mediating the terms under which state policy is applied in the local system. As such the public will expect less authoritarian expert stances and more display of skilled negotiator (cf. p. 18).

More specifically, Glasman's (1979) work suggests that whatever the role label--information processor, or negotiator of policy--the concept of transforming policies or laws into action is operational. Its forms and contents can be identified and defined through observing how an administrator influences the information process itself. In terms of educational policy this would entail "proact" forms such as making

> their own interpretation of the mandate's purpose by guessing as to what action (if any) may be taken upon the information generated, who will be affected by the actions, what questicns are in search of answers, and why the audience wants to know (p. 42).

As outlined in Table 7, researchers in addition to Glasman have offered a set of specific skills and observations of educational contexts for introducing the metaphors of leader as information processor and negotiator of policy. Although, as many have noted (e.g., Murphy, Hallinger, & Mitman, 1983; Sawada & Caley, 1985), the reconceptualization of leadership as a social process does

not guarantee the development of a conception of leadership that is consistent with general leadership theory or other explanatory models, these skills and observations highlight that the time may now be right to reconsider the well accepted premise that the first responsibility of a leader is to provide for a system of communication (Barnard, 1938). As noted in Table 7, and further described in other sections of this paper, it appears that some of the central concepts of recent work in linguistics will be useful in so far as they contribute to developing a theoretical focus for the empirical observations of information processing in social settings that have been published in educational administration and educational research journals.

(Insert Table 7 about here)

Table 7

Information Processing as a Social Process

Formal statements of skills identified as "successful"	Observations which lend support to translating these formal statements of "success"	Concepts from communication theory and research which can help translate "success" statements into an analytical stance
o seeking out opportunities to interact, to learn, and to display administrative skills (Atkinson, 1981, pp. 322, 324)	o on-going groups have well defined informal structures with sets of norms and implicit understandings regarding policies and procedures (Miskel & Cosgrove, 1985, p. 93)	participant structures
	o on-going groups are influenced in their judgement/evaluation processes by implicitly accepted group norms (Miskel & Cosgrove, 1985, p. 93)	construction of social norms enactment of routines
	o there is no one preferred style for all individuals or for all decisionmaking contexts (Brown, Newman, & Rivers, 1984, p. 395)	style options/shifts
	o although the decisionmaking process is usually characterized as a linear step-by-step process (with flow charts indicating when and what information is needed for the next decision), these schemas are not useful for considering how various decision contexts affect use of evaluation information (Brown, Newman, & Rivers, 1984, p. 393)	schema/frames

(Table 7 continued)

Formal statements of skills identified as "successful"	Observations which lend support to translating these formal statements of "success"	Concepts from communication theory and research which can help translate "success" statements into an analytical stance
o recognizing clues that signal diverse and often implicit definitions of an organizational and/or interpersonal situation (Murphy, Hollinger, & Milman, 1983, p. 298)	o organizations are human inventions. Choices are never completely predictable. The study of organizations is not the study of an ideal, but rather the study of human behavior in situations filled with ambiguity (Beneveniste, 1983, p. 23)	language per se is ambiguous
	o ambiguity or contradictions in goals, concepts, laws, and regulations is not unusual. Ability to cope with considerable ambiguity or contradictions, while avoiding open conflict, can be viewed as a major organizational and/or interpersonal opportunity factor when the following conditions of "opaqueness" in organizations exist: goals that are inconsistent and ill-defined can be both confusing and liberating. Participants may be continually required to define and redefine their understanding of a program, procedure, etc., and as such discover their processes of collaboration concepts that lack any consensus as to meaning and substance can be an opportunity for individuals to discover their preferences technologies that are unclear (i.e., activities, materials, structures, procedures) can often help develop goals through trial and error	interpretative frames

(Table 7 continued)

Formal statements of skills identified as "successful"	Observations which lend support to translating these formal statements of "success"	Concepts from communication theory and research which can help translate "success" statements into an analytical stance
	participation that is fluid and changing can result in increasing self-directed patterns of activity (e.g., metaphor of "lawn party"; participants do not come with a single purpose; they experience the project, or task, differently while there; and when they leave they take different bits of it with them, and make different things of what they experience) history (i.e., what happened, why it happened, and whether it had to happen) is not easily specified. Therefore, people vary in the amount of time and effort they devote. This situation can lead to effective use of interviews and occasions to discern what can be done, what is going on. (Bornstein, 1985, pp. 110-113)	

(Table 7 continued)

Formal statements of skills identified as "successful"	Observations which lend support to translating these formal statements of "success"	Concepts from communication theory and research which can help translate "success" statements into an analytical stance
o adopting a managerial language (Adkinson, 1981; Sawada & Caley, 1985)	o shifts in public expectations from authoritarian to skillful negotiation behaviors require shifts in communication styles and variety in reporting styles (James, 1982) e.g., (1) use of specific vocaabularies to orient action--a child in school is the "learner," his/her learning is "achievement" (Sawada & Caley, 1985) (2) use of anecdote, analogy, and metaphor rather than propositional forms (Sadler, 1980) (3) use of language to construct and reconstruct social meanings and interpretations (Popkewitz, 1979)	style options/shifts
	o the use of technical language introduces a perception of efficiency . . . to talk of reform or participation is to provide a symbol which condenses a variety of values and emotions into a single word or set of words. (At issue is how these meanings of reform relate to institutional contexts to match underlying patterns of school belief and conduct) (Popkewitz, 1979)	functions of language

(Table 7 continued)

Formal statements of skills identified as "successful"	Observations which lend support to translating these formal statements of "success"	Concepts from communication theory and research which can help translate "success" statements into an analytical stance
o cultivating alliances (Atkinson, 1981, p. 323)	o administrators/managers must develop, put forward, persuade people to accept, and act upon an argument (policy, procedure, etc.) put forth. This is essentially the activity of evaluating. To do so requires recognition and understanding of several problem areas: (1) while everyone agrees that information somehow informs decisions, the relationship is not direct, not simple (e.g., difference between "persuaded to" and "persuaded that") (2) knowledge about the relationships between evaluation and decisions; between evidence, inference, and action; and between knowing and doing, are far from perfect (3) to simply say that leaders need to be able to mount persuasive arguments is a posture of great jeopardy: an audience needs to know whether the situation and context described are sufficiently similar to its own. Therefore the speaker must provide realistic descriptions from a number of different perspectives and use multiple reasons to yield the credible, the plausable, the probable, not the certain (Sadler, 1980, p. 36)	communicative competence

(Table 7 continued)

Formal statements of skills identified as "successful"	Observations which lend support to translating these formal statements of "success"	Concepts from communication theory and research which can help translate "success" statements into an analytical stance
o recognizing, accepting, and enacting varying behaviors with task structure, social composition of peer group. organizational levels (e.g., organization's "need" for change; or, conditions that shape the task to be performed) (Atkinson, 1981)	o it is probably asking too much for a single task, or report from a task group, to cater effectively to a number of audiences at once . . . may require a variety of reporting styles (Sadler, 1980)	style options/shifts
	o task contexts need to be approached in terms of awareness of 4 types of subjective knowledge: (1) perceptions of individuals about the process (i.e., knowledge of who is affected by the potential decision) (2) perceptions of individuals about potential loss (3) perceptions of individuals about whether a "right" choice or solution is possible (4) perceptions of individuals about whether or not the problem is structured (5) perceptions of individuals about the "facts"--apparently, once evidence is processed and interpreted, it is the interpretations, rather than the facts that become part of working knowledge (Kennedy, 1984)	interpretive frames

(Table 7 continued)

Formal statements of skills identified as "successful"	Observations which lend support to translating these formal statements of "success"	Concepts from communication theory and research which can help translate "success" statements into an analytical stance
o managing of "public" impression" (e.g., discovering how expectations are translated into observable behaviors that are communicated to others (Atkinson, 1981);	o information processing contexts need to be approached in terms of awareness of 3 kinds of skills:	participant structures
		construction of norms
	(1) how to structure the problem (e.g., Kennedy, 1984, p. 173--the importance of group interactions in interpreting evidence)	enactment of routines
		style options/shifts
		interpretative frames
discovering how expectations that translate into "skilled political negotiator" behavior are communicated (James, 1982);	(2) how to educate others about how new information can be helpful (e.g., Kennedy, 1984, p. 173--can tilt a point of view; can accumulate with other information; can stimulate others to perceive the issues differently)	language per se is ambiguous
		communicative competence
		schema/frames
influencing the information process itself (Glasman, 1979)	(3) how to identify, label, and examine different kinds of information and sources of informations (e.g., Kennedy, 1984, p. 176--analysis of interpretations)	functions of language

By way of summary, the statements, observations, and concepts included in Table 7 are intended to meet the major communication skill needs identified in reviews of research on programs designed to prepare professional for leadership positions in the fields of law, public administration, higher education, and government:

- Identifying development and using specific concepts of communication skills that can be linked to professional actions. (Dinham & Sitten, 1986)

The term "communication skills" is delimited in Table 7 to refer to context specific discourse forms and strategies for presenting information and participating in group problem solving. For example, each of the six successful information processing skills is matched against a set of empirical observations which highlight some clearly stated ideas about how these successful discourse strategies for presenting information or participating may contribute to holding roles and action together to make policy more effective. After the reader has a chance to consider the formulations of success in educational leadership, and the public setting observations regarding these formulations, the concepts from communication theory and research can be compared to these findings in order to help translate "success" statements into an analytic stance.

The next step is to consider a similar format that was developed in order to consider formulations of success in rule decisionmaking.

Information Processing and Rule Decisionmaking as a Social Process in Legal Settings

During the past five years the National Science Foundation Law and Social Science Program has funded eleven studies that addressed how information is connected to discourse; decisions are connected to actions.

The National Science Foundation Law and Social Science Program studies are part of a total research area concerned with:

> processes that enhance or diminish compliance and the impact of law; causes and consequences of variations and changes in legal processes and institutions; personal, social, economic, technological, and cultural conditions affecting use of and responses to law; dynamics of disputing and dispute resolution mechanisms and strategies; determinants of legal decisionmaking; effects of and factors accounting for administrative rule making and the regulatory role of law; processes that influence the development of law and explain transformations between formal legal rules and law in action. (National Science Foundation, 1986, p. 28)

Five constructs related to information processing and rule decisionmaking appear across the eleven studies:

1. Cognitive and social dimensions of reasoning and decisionmaking
2. Cognitive and social determinants of norms, i.e., perceptions of, or interpretations of
3. Use of evidence (influence on decisionmaking)
4. Arbitration processes
5. Language in the legal process

As shown in Table 8, articles were sent on request from the principal investigator(s) for nearly all of these projects. The topics without available project reports were the target of a computer search in the Florida State University School of Law Legal Data Base.[3] Out of a total of 20 citations on these topics for the same years as the National Science Foundation studies, 7 articles were found to be pertinent to the descriptive study and are cited in this section.

(Insert Table 8 here)

Table 8

National Science Foundation Law and Social Science Program Funded Research Related to Information Processing and Rule Decisionmaking Processing (1980-1985)

Variables/ Definitions	NSF Grant Title	Articles, Reports Available
Reasoning and Decisionmaking	Models of Decisionmaking Among Law and Lawyer Judges	Legal Data Base: Kaufman (1981)
	Cognitive Dimensions of Legal Reasoning in Experts and Non-Experts	Johnson et al (1984) Lazzara (1985)
	Cognitive Process in Juror Decisionmaking	Pennington & Hastie (1986)
Cognitive and Social Determinants or Norms	Cognitive and Social Determinants of the Internalization of Legal Norms	Legal Data Base: Abraham (1981) Giraudo (1980) Harvard Law Review (1981)
	Perception of Community and Views of Legal Norms	Engel (in process)
Use of Evidence	Assessing and Calibrating Juror Sensitivity to Eyewitness Evidence	Cutler & Penrod (in press)
	Determinants and Dynamics of Evidence--v.--Verdict-Driven Jury Deliberation	Pennington & Hastie (1986)
	Jury Deliberations as Influenced by Relevant Case Features	Stodtbeck & Lipinski (1985; 1986)
Arbitration	Empirical Models on Arbitration	Bloom (1986)
	Models of Litigation Process	Rubenfeld (1985) Rubenfeld & Sappington (1986)
Language in the Legal Process	Language Conference Support	Legal Data Base: Andrews (1983) Stone (1981) Wroblewski (1985)

Table 9 presents an overview of the constructs and observations that were the focus of the National Science Foundation projects identified in Table 8. The overview is set out in terms of actual rule decisionmaking practice, and is offered as a sketch map of what may be looked for in attempting to assess the course of the processes involved in enactment of the proposed educational policy leadership roles of information processor and negotiator of policy. For convenience in discussion, aspects of communicative competence as negotiator of policy or rules can be divided into nine skills associated with successful information processing and rule decisionmaking as a social process. However, there are no hard and fast divisions between one skill and the next. From a linguistic point of view, developing familiarity with these skills is not simply knowing the formal statements identified as successful, but being able to grasp connections between formulations of success and concepts from communication theory and research which can help translate "success" statements into an ongoing analytical stance.

(Insert Table 9 here)

Table 9

Information Processing and Rule Decisionmaking Processing as a Social Process in Legal Settings

Formal Statements of Skills Identified as "Successful"	Observations Which Lend Support to Translating These Formal Statements of "Success"	Concepts from Communication Theory and Research Which Can Help Translate "Success" Statements into an Analytical Stance
o anticipating confusion regarding the meanings and purposes of social and legal behavior: those who are appointed to decide questions of 'law' must contend with all the drama, confusion, failure, and achievement that constitutes the human experience (Kaufman, 1984, p. 2)	o in the end, law is among the most human of all enterprises . . . for one thing it is not always clear whose 'purpose' we ought to be discerning, because a statute is the creation of many minds. Worse still is the fact 'that the difficulties of so-called interpretation arise when the legislature has no meaning at all; when the question which is raised on the statute never occurred to it. When what the [leaders] have to do is, not to determine what the legislature did mean on a point which was present to its mind, but to guess what it would have intended on a point not present to its mind, if the point had been present' (Kaufman, 1984, p. 8)	construction of social norms interpretive frames schema/frames

(Table 9 continued)

Formal Statements of Skills Identified as "Successful"	Observations Which Lend Support to Translating These Formal Statements of "Success"	Concepts from Communication Theory and Research Which Can Help Translate "Success" Statements into an Analytical Stance
o dealing with interpretation processes through awareness of: the complex interplay of language and intent; the fact of ambiguity or lack of consensus; the legislature who drafted the law; and, the paradox of law:	o to know the legislature is determining the expanse of a particular decision; to construct an understanding of the contours and contexts in which the legal point arose (Kaufman, 1984, p. 11)	enactment of routines
+ the task of interpreting statutes is one of the skills that must be mastered by the decision maker:		schema/frames
(a) interpreting based on handling the complex interplay of language and intent		
(b) interpreting based on assuming an active role in dealing with ambiguity which is often the result of the inability of lawmakers to reach a consensus		

(Table 9 continued)

Formal Statements of Skills Identified as "Successful"	Observations Which Lend Support to Translating These Formal Statements of "Success"	Concepts from Communication Theory and Research Which Can Help Translate "Success" Statements into an Analytical Stance
(c) interpreting based on untangling competing strands of thought, i.e., statutes oblige us to place ourselves in the shoes of the legislature ("to know the legislature is to know the law") (d) interpreting based on recognizing the paradox Law never is, but is always about to be. It is realized only when embodied in a judgement, and in being realized, expires (Kaufman, 1984, pp. 9-11)		

(Table 9 continued)

Formal Statements of Skills Identified as "Successful"	Observations Which Lend Support to Translating These Formal Statements of "Success"	Concepts from Communication Theory and Research Which Can Help Translate "Success" Statements into an Analytical Stance
o knowing how to use expert accounts of actions: + knowing how to utilize experts own accounts including planning, justifications, reasons + knowing how to utilize experts ongoing accounts of current actions + knowing how to bring background knowledge of experts to bear in appropriate situations (i.e., experts are recognized as such by their peers because they know how to organize situations of expertise -- or -- occasions of dealing with both facts and people) (Johnson, Johnson, & Little, 1984	o new approaches to the understanding of the concept of 'expertise' point out that actions, including actions that lead to public judgements of success, are produced by individuals in accordance with the meaning they attribute to situations in which they find themselves. People as agents do not respond to situations as much as they act in them, and in so doing, their actions become part of the situation itself (Johnson, Johnson, & Little, 1984, pp. 134-135)	communicative competence
	o relationships between the individual and others do not form a causal chain, i.e., situations causing meaning, meaning causing actions, but instead form a set of relationships which map onto each other (Johnson, Johnson, & Little, 1984, p. 135)	participant structure

(Table 9 continued)

Formal Statements of Skills Identified as "Successful"	Observations Which Lend Support to Translating These Formal Statements of "Success"	Concepts from Communication Theory and Research Which Can Help Translate "Success" Statements into an Analytical Stance
o understanding different dimensions of everyday practical reasoning regarding "what is a fact" + those who are appointed to decide questions of law must be able to capture dimensions of everyday practical reasoning; persuasion; or problem solving (Lazzara, 1985)	o the only valid way to capture or reconstruct practical reasoning; persuasion; or problem solving is to determine what counts as a problem to the person involved: Lawyer A says that some action counts as an assault and is therefore a problem, while B maintains that under a different interpretation of the 'same facts' the action was not an assault and there is no problem. In fact, a hearing is just a litigation about contexts. It is a battle over which interpretation will carry the day. In certain instances, the very existence of certain facts will be in question; consequently the form of the problem may evolve together with its contextual interpretation (Lazzara, 1985, p. 12)	functions of language

(Table 9 continued)

Formal Statements of Skills Identified as "Successful"	Observations Which Lend Support to Translating These Formal Statements of "Success"	Concepts from Communication Theory and Research Which Can Help Translate "Success" Statements into an Analytical Stance
o recognizing the need to recontextualize information to help others understand procedures: + those who are appointed to decide questions of law can profitably rely on findings of social scientists, including, the use of procedures that reinstates the context surrounding an event (Cutler & Penrod, in press)	o an important legal assumption in our system is that the jurors' comprehension of instructions will work psychologists and linguists who have examined and evaluated the comprehensibility of the language used in typical jury instructions have established many sources of confusion and specified some possible remedies (Cutler & Penrod, in press)	functions of language

(Table 9 continued)

Formal Statements of Skills Identified as "Successful"	Observations Which Lend Support to Translating These Formal Statements of "Success"	Concepts from Communication Theory and Research Which Can Help Translate "Success" Statements into an Analytical Stance
o knowing how to proceed through phases of evidence evaluation: (a) suspending judgement (b) providing decision alternatives only at the end of "elaborate rituals of evidence presentation" (c) attending to details of fostering an individual's construction of a given interpretation (i.e., details such as initiating the construction of an event for listeners through devices such as statemens of a main character's physical state, or psychological state) (d) in all, evidence evaluation skills involve listening (and hearing) individuals construct meaning through story construction (Pennington & Hastie, 1986)	o current models do not account for phenomena uncovered in interviews and observations of decisionmaking, i.e., the phenomena of considerable uncertainty and the use of a narrative story organization on legal information to deal with uncertainty and to keep track of relations between events this skill is notn captured in current models such as: all evaluation items are weighted and averaged all evidence items are treated as independent sources of information all evidence items are accumulated until a critical event occurs that fires the weight at a final value Note: these traditional decision models emphasize information combination and computation, and, ignore how meaning is constructed by a decisionmaker and then assigned to 'evidence.' (Pennington & Hastie, 1986)	communicative competence

(Table 9 continued)

Formal Statements of Skills Identified as "Successful"	Observations Which Lend Support to Translating These Formal Statements of "Success"	Concepts from Communication Theory and Research Which Can Help Translate "Success" Statements into an Analytical Stance
o awareness of the need to not assume that individuals know the same script for proceeding, or, getting on with the legal affairs at hand: + effective participants in policy and legal settings draw upon previously mastered social script; one such effective script is how to go about setting strangers to work attaining consensus (Strodbeck & Lipinski, 1986)	o the path of decisionmaking processes in groups is influenced by background expectations regarding deliberation, e.g. schema: deliberation as a ritual or deliberation as a game further work is needed to identify how best to characterize a deliberation context (Strodbeck & Lipinski, 1986)	enactment of routines

(Table 9 continued)

Formal Statements of Skills Identified as "Successful"	Observations Which Lend Support to Translating These Formal Statements of "Success"	Concepts from Communication Theory and Research Which Can Help Translate "Success" Statements into an Analytical Stance
o awareness of how to identify the processes associated with "fine-tuning" a matter under disagreement + it appears that expert arbitrators tend to engage in mechanical compromise behavior that can literally be described as "splitting the difference," however, analysis points out that the general skill called "fine tuning," is a set of specific ways to construct decisions so they map onto the underlying preferences that the expert knows how to induce from bargainers (Bloom, 1986, p. 14)	o the general finding that arbitrators "split the difference" raises an important question about why is arbitration in such demand? the task of "split the difference" could be accomplished more inexpensively by averaging the parties final offers . . . using a computer's random number generator what appears worthy of further work is developing new models capable of answering why arbitration is a rapidly growing method for resolving disputes: i.e., does the demand have something to do with the superior ability of an arbitrator to fine tune decisions, to endow them with legitimacy in the eyes of the disputants, and to induce bargainers to reveal true reflections of their underlying preferences (Bloom, 1986, p. 17)	participant structures enactment of routines style options/shifts

(Table 9 continued)

Formal Statements of Skills Identified as "Successful"	Observations Which Lend Support to Translating These Formal Statements of "Success"	Concepts from Communication Theory and Research Which Can Help Translate "Success" Statements into an Analytical Stance
o knowing how to encourage experts to do what most econometricians now consider to be proper practice--to report a full analysis of data in a way that is sensitive to lack of clear concensus and lack of one way to define issues such as fairness and equity (Rubenfeld, 1985)	o a complete analysis of issues such as fairness, equity, or efficiency must be based on the current meaning of "rules"--i.e., recognition that the meanings of "rules" such as appropriate level of care, or appropriate level of optimal compensatory damages, are not a clear, or literal set of definitions (Rubenfeld, 1986, p. 1)	construction of social norms

Several general characteristics of the studies presented in Table 9 stand out: First, all of the principal investigators worked within the assumption that expert knowledge is available through observation of skills in action, or through retrospective interviews based on recorded observations of professionals who are considered experts in their field. Second, all of these projects worked within the assumption that understandings of problems or issues facing the field of law cannot be solved without reference to relations between the problems of legal interpretation (i.e., interpretative directives and/or evaluations derived from law, statutes, and other normative acts), and some features of language (cf. Wroblewski, 1985). Overall, success in the preparation of leaders who work in legal settings is equated with:

1. Anticipating confusion regarding the meanings and purposes of social and legal behaviors;
2. Dealing with interpretation processes through awareness of: the complex interplay of language and intent; the fact of ambiguity or lack of consensus; the legislature who drafted the law; and, the paradox of law,
3. Knowing how to utilize expert accounts of action,
4. Understanding different dimensions of everyday practical reasoning regarding "what is a fact,"

5. Recognizing the need to recontextualize information to help others understand procedures,
6. Knowing how to proceed through phases of evidence evaluation,
7. Awareness of the need to not assume that individuals know the same script for proceeding, or, getting on with the legal affairs at hand,
8. Awareness of how to identify the processes associated with "fine-tuning" a matter under disagreement,
9. Knowing how to encourage experts to do what most econometricians now consider proper practice--to report a full analysis of data in a way that is sensitive to lack of clear consensus, and lack of one way to define issues such as fairness or equity.

As Andrews (1983) has noted: although a trial, or discussion of policies or procedures related to statutes, may be characterized as a labyrinth of language, in some ways legal talk is not notably different from everyday talk. As a dialect, legal language has several distinct characteristics: latin terms, archaic words; multiple embedded clauses; and infusion of ordinary words such as complaint and action with specific legal meaning. Yet, as

also being an everyday language, it shares the natural language spotlight with features such as vagueness/ ambiguity (i.e., lack of clarity and doubtful reference points), and contextuality of meaning (i.e., having many possible meanings of a semantic or pragmatic function which are not the cause of agreement, but the product of it) (Abraham, 1981; Wroblewsky, 1985).

As outlined in Table 9, all of the research projects concerned with information processing and rule decisionmaking processes give a high level of recognition of language as pivotal in laws and politics. It is therefore not surprising to read the following excerpt which was published in the Yale Law Journal:

> To view law as a language activity is broad enough to account for a range of competing perspectives, even if it cannot swallow them all. (Stone, 1981, p. 1156)

As demonstrated in the final leadership, law, and language synthesis columns presented in Table 10, multiple concepts from communication theory and research suggest points of convergence for considering educational leadership as a language activity in new policy and leadership studies. As such they are offered as a set of guides worth testing in case studies of the language relationship between policy and leadership. The theory and research design ideas listed in each column are recommended with a note similar to Stone´s

observation of the contribution of language perspectives in the study of law: To view the policy arena as a language activity for those who would be educational leaders, and as an important site to construct an image of information processing and rule decisionmaking as a social process, is broad enough to account for a range of competing perspectives, even if it cannot swallow them all.

(Insert Table 10 here)

Table 10

Concepts from Communication Theory and Research Which Can Help to Identify the Complexities of How Language Is Actually Used for Presenting Information and Participating in Problemsolving Across Policy and Leadership Settings

Successful Contributions to Educational Policy Decisionmaking (i.e., Successful Utilization)	Successful Information Processing Skills	Successful Information Processing and Rule Decision-making Skills	Concepts from Communication Theory and Research
accumulate across-discipline sources of knowledge along with basic issues of concern	seeking out opportunities to interact . . . to learn implicit "rules"	attend to details of individuals' construction of a given interpretation (i.e., individuals often impose a narrative story organization to pull together events)	schema/frames
contribute to building a whole picture of the problem or issue	recognizing clues that signal diverse and often implicit definitions of success	know how to capture dimensions of everyday practical reasoning	functions of language
develop new images of a problem and/or develop and use new metaphors	adopting a managerial language	endow arbitration decisions with legitimacy in the eyes of disputants	construction of social norms
contribute to recognition of policy-makers cognitive/ scientific expertise and social expertise	cultivating alliances	know how to utilize experts own accounts on their actions	interpretative frames enactment of routines

(Table 10 continued)

Successful Contributions to Educational Policy Decisionmaking (i.e., Successful Utilization)	Successful Information Processing Skills	Successful Information Processing and Rule Decision-making Skills	Concepts from Communication Theory and Research
provide different oral and written discourse strategies	enacting varying behaviors with task structures	know how to use procedures that reinstate the context surrounding the event	style options/shifts communicative competence
stimulate unique interpretation of evidence; policies; rules	managing "public impression"	attend to the task of interpreting evidence, policies, rules, by assuming an active role in dealing with contributions and constraints of ambiguity	language per se is ambiguous

Summary

There is much to be done not only in elucidating the problem of building a more realistic view of research utilization and leadership functions in the policy arena, but also in designing measures to counteract miscommunication in a society characterized as having a wide range of expectations about how verbal and/or written information is to be conveyed. The multidisciplinary analyses that comprise this paper are gropings in that direction. They are marred by the limitations of one individual's selective attention to AERA, EAA, NSF and sociolinguistic data sets. Hopefully, others will "see" and interpret the sources mentioned, and the sources omitted, in a more systematic way of proceeding. But it would be a missed opportunity to end this paper with the usual motto that more research is needed. Of course more is needed. But, more to the point, what is needed is a new look at how concepts from communication theory and research can help identify the complexities of how language is actually used for presenting information and participating in problem solving across policy and leadership settings. As outlined in Table 10, there exists today a pragmatic sense of what is successful in information processing; what contributions become successful in policymaking; and, what successful rule decisionmaking involves. The concepts from communication

theory and research may help to move us to address the unanswered question: We know these skills are successful, but why?

Notes

1. Medium: a term used in the study of communication to refer to the functionally distinct dimension in which a message is transmitted. In linguistics, the basic media are speech and writing . . . and the analysis of differences between these media in structural and functional terms is an important topic in linguistics. The term is usually distinguished from 'channel' (as used in communications theory), which refers to the physical means whereby a (spoken or written) message is transmitted, such as a wire, air, light, etc. (Crystal, 1980, p. 224).
2. A compilation of linguistic and paralinguistic features that may take on the force of norms, rules, and expectations is available in Wallat (1984, pp. 27-29).
3. Following notification from personnel at the National Science Foundation that interim and/or final reports were not available from the agency, Mr. Gerry Miller, a Ph.D. candidate at Florida State, undertook the search for the documents referred to in this paper. His patience, industry, and "stick-withitness" in tracking down the principal investigators and legal data base references deserve this formal note of thanks.

REFERENCES

Abraham. K. S. (1981). Three fallacies of interpretations: A comment on precedent and judicial decision. Arizona Law Review, 23, 771-783.

Adkison, J. A. (1981). Women in school administration: A review of the research. Review of Educational Research, 51(3), 311-348.

Alkin, M. C., Daillak, R., & White, P. (1979). Using evaluations: Does evaluation make a difference? Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Andrews, L. B. (1983). Trial by language. Student Lawyer, 12, 11-17.

Barnard, C. I. (1938). The functions of the executive. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Benveniste, G. (1983). Bureaucracy. San Francisco, CA: Boyd & Fraser.

Bissell, J. (1979). Use of educational evaluation and policy studies by the California legislature. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 1(3), 29-37.

Bloom, D. E. (1986). Empirical models of arbitrator behavior under conventional arbitration. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Institute of Economic Research. (NSF Grant SES 83 09148)

Bornstein, R. (1985). Ambiguity as opportunity and constraint: Evolution of a general sex equity education program. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 7(2), 99-114.

Boyer, E. (1983). High school. New York: Harper & Row.

Brown, R. D., & Newman, D. L. (1982). An investigation of the effect of different data presentation formats and order of arguments in stimulated adversary evaluation. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 4(2), 197-203.

Brown, R. D., Newman, D. L., & Rivers, L. S. (1984). A decisionmaking context model for enhancing evaluation utilization. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 6(4), 393-400.

Cazden, C. B. (1986). Classroom discourse. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.). Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 432-463). New York: Macmillan.

Chafe, W. (1977). Creativity in verbalization and its implications for the nature of stored knowledge. In R. Freiedle (Ed.), Discourse production and comprehension (pp. 44-56). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Cohen, D. K., & Garet, M. S. (1975). Reforming educational policy with applied social research. Harvard Educational Review 45(1), 17-43.

Cohen, M. (April, 1986). Information needs and sources of state education policymakers: Report of a national survey. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Assoc., San Francisco, CA.

Cook-Gumperz, J. (1973). Social control and socialization. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Crystal, D. (1980). A first dictionary of linguistics and phonetics. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Cutler, B. L., & Penrod, S. D. (in press). Context restatement and eyewitness identification. In G. Davies & D. Thomas (Eds.), Memory and contexts: Context and memory (10 pgs.). NY: Wiley. (NSF Grant SES 84 11721)

Datta, L. (1982). Strange bedfellows: The politics of qualitative methods. American Behavioral Scientist, 26(1), 133-144.

DeMauro, T. (1967). Ludwig Wittgenstein: His place in the development of semantics. Netherlands: D. Reidel.

Dinham, S. M., & Stritter, F. T. (1986). Research on professional education. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 952-970). New York: Macmillan.

Dye, T. R. (1984). Understanding public policy. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Elmore, R. F. (1980). Complexity and control: What legislators and administrators can do about implementing public policy. (U.S. Department of Education purchase order no. NIE-P-77-0070). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Engel, D. (in process). Perceptions of community and views of legal norms. Buffalo, NY: State University of New York Amherst Campus Faculty of Law and Jurisprudence. (NSF 85 11105)

Filmore, C., & O'Conner, M. C. (1968, April). Findings of the Berkeley reading project. Paper presented at the Conference on Research Perspectives on Language, Literacy and Schooling. Berkeley, CA: Center for the Study of Writing.

Fisher, S. (1983). Doctor talk/patient talk: How treatment decisions are negotiated in doctor-patient communication. In S. Fisher & A. D. Todd (Eds.), The social organization of doctor-patient communication (pp. 135-158). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Florio, D., Behrmann, M. M., & Goltz, D. L. (1979). What do policy makers think of educational research and evaluation? Or do they? Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 1(6), 61-87.

Freedle, R. (1980, April). Interaction of language use with ethnography and cognition. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA. (Available from author, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, NJ)

Fuhrman, S. (1986, April). Research utilization in the state policymaking process: Report of case studies. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Assoc., San Francisco, CA.

Giraudo, J. P. (1980, October). Legal reasoning and the judicial process. American Bar Association Journal, p. 1170.

Glasman, N. S. (1979). A perspective on evaluation as an administrative function in education. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 1(5), 39-44.

Green, J. L. (1983). Exploring classroom discourse: Linguistic perspectives on teaching-learning processes. Educational Psychologist, 18(3), 180-199.

Gumperz, J. J. (1982a). Discourse strategies. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J. J. (1982b). Language and social identity. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J. J. (1982c). The linquistic basis of communicative competence. In D. Tannen (Ed.), Analyzing discourse: Text and talk (pp. 323-334). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Gumperz, J. J., Aulakh, G., & Kaltman, H. (1982). Thematic structure and progression in discourse. In J. J. Gumperz (Ed.), Language and social identity (pp. 22-56). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J. J., & Cook-Gumperz, J. (1982). Introduction: Language and the communication of social identity. In J. J. Gumperz (Ed.), Language and social identity (pp. 1-21). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1973). Explorations in the functions of language. London: Edward Arnold Publishers, Ltd.

Hannaway, J. (1985). Administrative costs and administrative behaviors associated with categorical programs. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 7(1), 57-64.

Harvard Law Review. (1981). Note: Plurality decisions and judicial decisionmaking. Harvard Law Review, 94, 1127-1146.

Heath, S. B. (1986, April). Mexican origin students: The researcher's commitment to past and present. Paper presented at the conference on Research Perspectives on Language, Literacy, and Schooling, School of Education, Division of Language and Literacy, University of California, Berkeley.

Hymes, D. (1972). Introduction. In C. B. Cazaen, V. P. John, & D. Hymes (Eds.), Functions of language in the classroom (pp. xi-ivii). New York: Teachers College Press.

Hymes, D. H. (1979). Language in education: Forward to fundamentals. In O. K. Garnica & M. L. King, Language, children and society (pp. 1-18). New York: Pergamon Press.

James, H. T. (1982). Educational administration and organization: A 40-year perspective. Educational Researcher, 11(2), 14-18.

Jupp, T. C., Roberts, C., & Cook-Gumperz, J. (1982). Language and disadvantaged: The hidden process. In J. J. Gumperz (Ed.), Language and social identity (pp. 232-256). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, P. E., Johnson, M. G., & Little, R. K. (1984). Expertise in trial advocacy: Some considerations for inquiry into its nature and development. Campbell Law Review, 7(2), 119-143.

Kaufman, I. R. (1984). The anatomy of decisionmaking. Fordham Law Review, 53, 1-22.

Kennedy, M. M. (1984). How evidence alters understanding and decisions. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 6(3), 207-226.

Kirst, M. (1986, April). Discussant: Improving research utilization by state education policymakers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Lazzara, P. J. (1985). Foundations for a method of knowledge analysis. Unpublished doctoral dissertation (NSF Grant SES 81 11295), University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Lysaught, J. P. (1984). Toward a comprehensive theory of communications: A review of selected contributions. Educational Administration Quarterly, 20(3), 101-127.

Madley, D. L. (1982). Some benefits of integrating qualitative and quantitative methods in program evaluation, with illustrations. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 4(2), 223-236.

Mehan, H. (1984). Institutional decision-making. In B. Rogoff & J. Lave (Eds.), Everyday cognition: Its development in social context (pp. 41-66). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mishler, E. G. (1979). Meaning in context: Is there any other kind? Harvard Educational Review, 49(1), 1-19.

Miskel, C., & Cosgrove, D. (1985). Leader succession in school settings. Review of Educational Research, 55(1), 87-105.

Mitchell, B. (1985, May). Frameworks for examining policy development in an era of excellence. Preconvention Institute presented at the meeting of the International Reading Association, New Orleans, LA.

Mitchell, D. E. (1980). Social science impact on legislative decision making: Processes and substance. Educational Researcher, 9(10), 9-19.

Murphy, J., Hallinger, P., & Mitman, A. (1983). Problems with research on educational leadership: Issues to be addressed. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 5(3), 297-305.

National Service Foundation. (1986). Guide to programs fiscal year 1986. Washington, DC: Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office.

Pennington, N., & Hastie, R. (1986). Evidence evaluation in decision making. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Graduate School of Business Center for Decision Research. (NSF Grant SES 80 12002)

Philips, S. U. (1983). The invisible culture. New York: Longman.

Popkewitz, T. S. (1979). Educational reform and the problem of institutional life. Educational Researcher, 8(3), 3-8.

Reynolds, P. D. (1983). A primer in theory construction (11th printing). Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill Educational Publishing.

Rubinfeld, D. L., & Sappington, D. E. M. (1986). Efficient awards and standards of proof in judicial proceedings (36 pgs.). Berkeley, CA: University of California Berkeley School of Law Boalt Hall. (NSF Grant SES 84 09858)

Rubinfeld, D. L. (1985). Econometrics in the courtroom. Columbia Law Review, 85(5), 1048-1097.

Sadler, D. R. (1980). Conveying the findings of evaluative inquiry. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 2(2), 53-57.

Sawada, D., & Caley, M. T. (1985). Dissipative structures: New metaphors for becoming in education. Educational Researcher, 14(3), 13-19.

Spring, J. (1985). American education: An introduction to social and political aspects. New York; Longman.

Sproull, L. S. (1981). Managing education programs: A micro-behavioral analysis. Human Organization, 40(2), 113-122.

Stone, C. D. (1981). From a language perspective. The Yale Law Journal, 90, 1149-1192.

Strike, K. A. (1979). An epistemology of practical research. Educational Researcher, 8(1), 10-16.

Strodtbeck, F. L., & Lipinski, R. M. (1985). Becoming first among equals: Moral considerations in jury foreman selection. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49(4), 927-936.

Strodtbeck, F. L., & Lipinski, R. M. (1986). Woman jurors, then and now (26 pgs.). Chicago: University of Chicago Social Psychology Laboratory. (NSF Grant 79 10982; 81-04446)

Tannen, D. (1984). Conversational style. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Pub. Corp.

Tannen, D., & Wallat, C. (1983). Doctor/mother/child communication: Linguistic analysis of a pediatric interaction. In S. Fisher & A. L. Todd (Eds.), The social organization of doctor-patient communication (pp. 203-220). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Tannen, D., & Wallat, C. (1986). Medical professionals and parents: A linguistic analysis of communication across contexts. Language in Society, 15, 295-312.

Tizard, J. (1983). Psychology and social policy. In A. D. B. Clarke & B. Tizard (Eds.), Child development and social policy: The life and work of Jack Tizard (pp. 233-246). Leicester, Great Britain: The British Psychological Society.

U.S. Department of Education. (1983). Grants for research on law and government in education: Program announcement 83-0001. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Wallat, C. (1986). Literacy, language, and schooling: State policy implications. In D. Bloome (Ed.), Literacy and schooling (pp. 291-309). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Pub. Corp.

Wallat, C., & Green, J. (1982). Construction of social norms by teachers and children: The first year of school. In K. M. Borman (Ed.), The social life of children in a changing society (pp. 97-122). Hillsdale, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum Associates.

Wallat, C., & Plazza, C. (in process). Analysis of the relation between functions and discourse forms used in the presentation and preparation of policy reports.

Wallat, C., & Plazza, C. (in press). Policy implications related to teaching and learning mathematics and science. In C. Emihovich (Ed.), Locating learning across the curriculum: Ethnographic perspectives on classroom research (33 pgs.). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Pub. Corp.

Wallat, C., & Plazza, C. (1986). The nation responds: Directions for literacy, language, and teacher performance research. Theory into Practice, 25(2), 141-147.

Wildavsky, A. (1977). Principles for a graduate school of public policy. Urban Analysis, 4, 3-28.

Wolcott, H. F. (1973). The man in the principal's office: An ethnography. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Wroblewski, J. (1985). Legal language and legal interpretation. Law and Philosophy, 4, 239-245.